



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,923	01/03/2005	Norbert Kroth	1454-1588	7678
21171	7590	10/03/2008		
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER KAMPURIA, SHARAD K	
			ART UNIT 2617	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/03/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/519,923

Applicant(s)

KROTH ET AL.

Examiner

SHARAD RAMPURIA

Art Unit

2617

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 14-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 14-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 14-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Oom et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 6,738,625) in view of **Andersson et al.** [US 6912390].

Referring to claim 14, Oom teaches a method for controlling transmission of data in a radio communication system having a hierarchical network architecture (Figure 2 and Column 1, Lines 32-35), comprising: transmitting load information about a current load situation of the physical resources by the first device to a second device at a second hierarchy higher than the

first hierarchy within the hierarchical network architecture for controlling a load distribution (Column 11, Lines 1-5 and Column 10, Lines 64-67).

Oom doesn't teach specifically, administering physical resources for a data transmission to user equipment by a first device at a first hierarchy within the hierarchical network architecture, the first device providing a physical radio connection interface to the user equipment. However, **Andersson** teaches in an analogous art, that the administering physical resources for a data transmission to user equipment by a first device at a first hierarchy within the hierarchical network architecture, the first device providing a physical radio connection interface to the user equipment; (e.g. a physical layer used to connects physically; Col. 15, 12-29, Col. 24; 6-33) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify Oom including administering physical resources for a data transmission to user equipment by a first device at a first hierarchy within the hierarchical network architecture, the first device providing a physical radio connection interface to the user equipment in order to provide an end-to-end signaling protocol is utilized to establish at least a node-transcendent one of plural distinct connection or link segments comprising a radio connection involving a user equipment unit. The plural distinct connection segments extend in series between a device in a first radio network control node and a device in a base station controlled by a second radio network control node. The first radio network control node serves as a serving radio network control (SRNC) node and the second radio network control serves as a drift radio network control (DRNC) node for the radio connection with the user equipment unit.

Referring to claim 15, Oom et al further teaches wherein the load information includes load states for an area of the radio communication system supplied by the first device (Column 7, Lines 49-54 and Column 8, Lines 4-11).

Referring to claim 16, Oom et al further teaches wherein the load information includes load values averaged over time for at least one of defined operating parameters and signaling types of the radio communication system for radio data connections between user equipment and a third device of a lowest hierarchy (Column 7, Lines 49-60).

Referring to claim 17, Oom et al further teaches cell load reporting; and checking on an assignment of user equipment to specific devices of the lowest hierarchy based on said cell load reporting (Column 1, Lines 31-37, Column 7, Lines 65-67 and Column 8, Lines 1-5).

Referring to claim 18, Oom et al further teaches wherein the radio communication system is a cellular radio communication system (Column 1, Lines 54-59), and wherein said method further comprises checking on a handover option for at least one user equipment from a first cell of the radio communication system to a second cell of the radio communication system based on said cell load reporting (Column 10, Lines 64-67 and Column 8, Lines 4-11).

Referring to claim 19, Oom et al further teaches wherein said cell load reporting includes transmissions depending on particular time events (Column 7, Lines 49-60).

Referring to claim 20, Oom et al further teaches wherein said cell load reporting includes periodic transmissions (Column 7, Lines 49-60).

Referring to claim 21, Oom et al further teaches wherein said cell load reporting includes transmissions depending on specific operational events of the radio communication system (Column 7, Lines 49-60).

Referring to claim 22, Oom et al further teaches wherein said cell load reporting is undertaken as a function of defined load states for the area of the radio communication system served by the first device (Column 1, Lines 31-37, Column 7, Lines 65-67, Column 8, Lines 1-5 and Column 10, Lines 64-67).

Referring to claim 23, Oom et al further teaches wherein said cell load reporting is undertaken as a function of defined threshold values for the load states (Column 10, Lines 64-67 and Column 11, Lines 1-15).

Referring to claim 25, Oom et al teaches a radio communication system having a hierarchical network architecture with devices for control of transmission of data to user equipment and administration of physical resources (Figure 2 and Column 1, Lines 32-35), comprising: at least one high level device at a first hierarchy within the hierarchical network architecture, controlling load distribution of the radio communication system (Column 11, Lines

1-5 and Column 10, Lines 64-67); and at least one low level device at a second hierarchy lower than the first hierarchy, transmitting to said high level device, information about a current load situation of the physical resources (Column 11, Lines 1-5 and Column 10, Lines 64-67).

Oom doesn't teach specifically, administering physical resources for a data transmission to user equipment by a first device at a first hierarchy within the hierarchical network architecture, the first device providing a physical radio connection interface to the user equipment. However, **Andersson** teaches in an analogous art, that the administering physical resources for a data transmission to user equipment by a first device at a first hierarchy within the hierarchical network architecture, the first device providing a physical radio connection interface to the user equipment; (e.g. a physical layer used to connects physically; Col. 15, 12-29, Col. 24; 6-33)

Claims 24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oom & **Andersson** and further in view of Jain et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 20020193118)

Referring to claims 24 and 26, Oom & **Andersson** teaches the limitations of claim 24 and 26, but does not teach controlling a transmission of data packets in a packet data transmission system. Jain teaches controlling a transmission of data packets in a packet data transmission system (0021 and 0032). Therefore at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Oom & **Andersson** with the teaching of Jain of controlling a transmission of data packets in a packet data transmission

system to understand that the principles of invention could be applicable to other wireless communication systems.

Response to Amendments & Remarks

Applicant's arguments filed on 07/23/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Relating to Claim 14:

In view of the fact, that ANDERSSON teaches, "A user equipment unit (UE), such as user equipment unit (UE) 30 shown in FIG. 3, communicates with one or more cells or one or more base stations (BS) 28 over a radio or air interface 32. Each of the radio interface 32, the Iu interface, the Iub interface, and the Iur interface are shown by dash-dotted lines in FIG. 3." (Andersson, Col.8; 22-27). And "As explained hereinafter, in the present invention the confirm establish messages provided by the end-to-end protocol for various distinct connection segments are sequenced so that the originating node (the first radio network control node, i.e., serving radio network controller (RNC) 26.sub.1) does not receive an establish connection confirmation message in the connection layer (via the end-to-end signaling) until the user plane path is fully set up so that user data can be sent between the originating node and the terminating node (e.g., the device in base station 28.sub.2-1)." (Andersson, Col.10; 36-45). Thus, it is evidently, the explanations above is directed to telecommunications systems and methods for a radio connection between a mobile and BS, and also later connection between RNC's that

positively, edify by ANDERSSON. Hence, it is believed that ANDERSSON still teaches the claimed limitations.

The above arguments also recites for the other independent claims, consequently the response is the same explanation as set forth above with regard to claim 14.

Because the remaining claims depend directly/indirectly, from one of the independent claims discussed above, as a result the response is the same justification as set forth above.

With the intention of that explanation, it is believed and as enlighten above, the refutation are sustained.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharad Rampuria whose telephone number is (571) 272-7870. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F. (8:30-5 EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dwayne Bost can be reached on (571) 272-7023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000 or

EBC@uspto.gov.

/Sharad Rampuria/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2617